

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 07/322,604 03/10/89 STREBER W SCH922 EXAMINER HM22/1130 WILLIAM F. LAWRENCE, ESQ. ART UNITY PAPER NUMBER CURTIS, MORRIS & SAFFORD, P.C. 745 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10151 1646 DATE MAILED: 11/30/99 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Responsive to communication filed on 7/20/1/ This application has been examined days from the date of this letter. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 Part | THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. 3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. SUMMARY OF ACTION 1. [Claims 17, 18, 2), 32, 33, 35,42, 43, 45-6] are pending in the application. are withdrawn from consideration. 2. Claims\_ have been cancelled. 3. E Claims 17, 18, 23, 32, 33, 42, 43, 45-57 4. Claims \_\_\_\_ are rejected. 5. Claims\_\_\_ aré objected to. 6. Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_ are □ acceptable; □ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_ \_. has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). has been approved; disapproved (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed \_ 12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_ \_\_ ; filed on \_ 13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. 14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

PTOL-326 (Rev. 2/93)

Application/Control Number: 07/322,604

Art Unit: 1646

- 1) Claims 17, 18, 23, 32, 33, 35, 42, 43 and 45 to 53 are pending in the instant application. Claims 18 and 35 have been amended as requested by Applicant in Paper Number 29, filed 20 September of 1999.
- 2) Any objection or rejection of record which is not expressly repeated in this action has been overcome by Applicant's response and withdrawn.
- 3) The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
  - 4) Claims 17, 18, 23, 32, 33, 42, 43 and 45 to 53 are allowed.

## 5) M.P.E.P. 706.03(k) Duplicate Claims

"Inasmuch as a patent is supposed to be limited to only one invention or, at most, several closely related indivisible inventions, limiting an application to a single claim, or a single claim to each of the related inventions might appear to be logical as well as convenient. However, court decisions have confirmed applicant's right to restate (i.e., by plural claiming) the invention in a reasonable number of ways. Indeed, a mere difference in scope between claims has been held to be enough.

Nevertheless, when two claims in an application are duplicates, or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other claim under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim.

Claim 35 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 32.

When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim

Application/Control Number: 07/322,604

Art Unit: 1646

to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John D. Ulm whose telephone number is (703) 308-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Hutzell can be reached at (703) 308-4310.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

JOHN ULM PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1800

Page 3